November 30, 1973
UP TO DATE REPORT BY JERRY MANDER ON ALL GRANTS MADE DURING 1972, INCLUDING COMMENTARY AND SCORECARD

Joan McIntyre/~~Project Jonah~~ ~~$15,000~~

A fellowship/("Agent") grant to Joan McIntyre resulted in the creation of the first international activist organization devoted to permanently stopping the killing of whales, dolphins and other cetaceans for commercial purposes. Organization has undertaken publicity internationally on (a) the depletion of the whales, (b) the trivial nature of the commodities for which they are sacrificed--cosmetics, pet food, and lubricants, and (c) the extraordinary intelligence of these creatures. Project Jonah succeeded in persuading UN Environmental conference to recommend a Ten Year Moritorium on whale-killing. The case was also carried to the International Whaling Commission meetings of 1972 and 1973. In the first year the vote was overwhelmingly against the moratorium, but following mounting international criticism, including a $30,000 publicity campaign by Project Jonah, the 1973 vote was actually in favor of the moratorium but not, unfortunately, by the needed 2/3 majority. Joan's plans are now centered in three areas: 1) continuing international publicity of a very aggressive sort (this is now being headed by Gail Madonia, a writer and editor), 2) an international children's protest campaign, particularly against the behavior of Japanese whaling industry, and 3) a focused effort inside Japan to reverse public opinion and industrial behavior, possibly ~~xxxxxx~~ including a major international conference.

Comments: Joan has probably been the pluperfect "agent" within the original POINT concept. From the day she received the money she was activated to undertake a project that would not have existed otherwise. Almost singlehandedly she has led the international campaign on whales, generated publicity, raised large sums of money, kept several offices running, persuaded government bureacrats, and still managed to keep the tone of the argument on an intellignet, human, biocentric level. By the end of the third year of POINT I wouldn't be a bit surprised if she schieves what she set out to, and if so, the POINT participation will have had much to do with the success. At that point I expect she will immediately embark on a new adventure and if I were still in a position to do so would probably (even blindly) support that.

(2) Marijuana Educational Fund

This grant provided a fund for the publication and distribution of information offsetting the generally bad press that marijuana received in this country fro forty years. Particular emphasis was placed upon materials that might be useful in supporting efforts to place an initiative re: marijuana use on the California ballot. This effort was successful in 1972, i.e., such an initiative did get on the ballot but it failed to pass.

The organizaoion, as the elction came near, became beset by internal dissentions and hassles causing the departure of their most effective organizer, Pat Farrington before election time, and following the balloting, the departure of Robert Ashford the other statewide coordinator.

Since then, others have taken the effort over and a second attempt is now being made to put the question on the California ballot. The organizers at present are Michael Aldrich, Gordon Brownell and Tod Mikuriya, a crowd about which I have misgivings. I suspect they will get it on the ballot again, however, and with the changing climate, these days, have a chance to win.

Comment: It is difficult to judge the effectiveness of a grant of this sort. It was an important help to Farrington and Ashford in the early days of the first initiative--they say critical help--but as to whether or not it has "lasting" meaning who knows? It is my opinion, however, that small amounts of money, in early stages of an organizing effort, can spell the difference in terms of discouragement vs. encouragement and the fixing of attitudes of maybe-we're-gonna-make-it. So although a definitive judgement on this grant is impossible, it's the sort of grant that I continue to feel is worthwhile to make. It's really a question of how immaculate the timing is.

(3) Public Advocates/Study and investigation of legal action against war

This was an investigation and legal analysis of possible legal action on behalf of a war-injured Vietnam veteran who had initially volunteered for action. The case would have been based on the principle of "fraud in the inducement" in which a party can be held liable for an injury caused as the result of fraudulent information.

If this legal action had proven feasible, it might have been possible to expose the whole pattern of government lying about the Vietnam War and the effect it had on the bodies of thousands of people.

The investigation was accomplished within several months of the grant (on file at POINT office) and it was determined that a legal action of the sort we'd planned would have been extremely difficult to win, although some residual publicity benefits might have developed. It was decided to abandon the project.

Comment: This was a $200 grant to determine the feasibility of what might have been an immensely important legal action. The fact

that it didn't work out does not discourage me from the notion of making such investigations in the future. (Actually, in 1973 a similar investigative grant turned up a number of very hot looking actions that might reach fruition re: saving Brazilian Indians.) My feeling is that small investigative grants are a good idea, as it is this sort of funding which is usually hard to come by.

(4) "Earthlight"/San Francisco Ecology Center

~~This is~~ A weekly publication designed to be sent to 8-10 year old children, in schools and out, ~~which is~~ intended to present an offsetting impression of the corporate all-america, consumption-oriented, materialist views of "Weekly Reader" and the other widely circulated children's weeklies. The publication has an ecological bias, but considers within the ecology definition human ecology, racism, sexism, specieism and political-resource exploitation.

Thirty issues of "Earthlight" were put out ~~xxxxxx~~ and some 5,500 subscriptions were obtained but, in the end, they couldn't make a go of it financially. The POINT grant ($4000) enabled them to function for a full year (together with their subscription income) but a negotiation with Harper & Row concerning textbook rights finally fell apart.

Comment: ~~Xxx~~ What we got for ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ the money was one year of an extremely professional competent publication which did, at least, show that it was possible to talk to kids intelligently about complicated issues. However, it didn't make it as either a weekly or a textbook (although there's still a chance of that) and I suppose would have to be considered a meaningless (bad) grant. I think the problem at root was that their budget was too tight. In trying to be attractive to investors and foundations, they overestimated what three people could accomplish. As it turned out, what they could accomplish was turning out a fine weekly publication, but they couldn't stay on top of promotional activities, or fund-raising and that lack of attention was what did ~~them~~ them in. What I learned, I suppose, was that it is not enough to have a great idea and a competent professional staff. A little more budget and time-flow analysis would have been usefl. (A written statement by Josh Gitomer of Earthlight is enclosed.)

(5) Prof. Herbert Kutchins/A study of police killings

This was intended to be a three part study--local, California and national--examining all instances of killings by policemen and of policemen with a mind to finding out, finally, who kills whom more often, who starts the trouble, and what the pattern of violence actually~~xx~~ is, police reports notwithstanding.

In fact, the study is running along very, very slowly and despite prodding by me it now seems to me that this grant was mistake. The problems that Kutchins is facing are personal ones--his life is in some degree of disarray at the moment; divorce

etcetera and it looks like this thing will be delayed still more. Complicating fact is that he is now at the University of Hawaii (he was formerly at Sonoma State) and is not in an ideal position to do his research. In my last conversation with him, I informed him that he hadn't done what he'd promised and that there was a chance we would ask for the money back. He said it was still intact, but that he could and would finish the project by September. My feeling is that I will shortly write him and inform him that that's too late and to forward the money back to POINT which can make other use of it. I feel certain he will comply.

Comment: Don't give grants to people about to get divorced.

(6) Susan Halas

This was the first of three grants that were given in 1972 and 1973 to Susan, the grand total of which was $4,600. Her work in these two years has been divided in roughly two parts: 1) a study and report on the state of the videotape world (now on file at POINT), and 2) the formation of a public interest public relations operation on behalf of non-profit groups of all description.

Comment: I consider Susan to have been one of the most successful grants I made. A brief glance at her own report (which is attached) shows an almost unbelievable energy, interest, achievement and range. She has turned out to be a supremely effective publicist for an eclectic list of "clients" and in addition has written wisely and effectively on videotape, has organized a number of consumer and Indian-activist actions of her own. She has done the work of three of four people and has done it extremely well. She has also gotten further into the public interest P.R. thing than she ever expected she would and is busily looking for grants elsewhere to keep the trip going. Pacific Change is interested and I suspect we'll have Susan around for a long time. (PS-Be sure to read her reports)

(7) Barbara Richter

This was a $1,000 grant to explore and plan a television cable program of Barbara's conception: The First People's TV News Program. The idea was a program in which news was not considered to be strictly objective reporting upon the big events of the day, but which instead gave legitimacy to small events, or opinions or subjectivity. It was a stab at breaking out of the centralized information system that we all suffer from and which encourages the notion that the major events of our lives are happening, out of our control, elsewhere. But alas, Barbara's idea was better than her execution. She sent

me two drafts of her plan (the latter is on file at POINT) and described her efforts to interest cable stations, and broadcast stations and "angels" in the idea. But except for the fact that she wound becoming Stewart Mott's girlfriend ~~xxxxxxx~~ nothing much has come from this whole effort.

Comment: This is one of three or four grants I made during the first two years wherein I made the error of going strictly for the idea, without much ~~xxxxxxx~~ thought devoted to figuring out whether the person with the idea could pull it off. Barbara could not, at least not yet. I still think the grant, small as it was, was probably worth it just to see if such a notion could be successful--if it had been it might have become a prototype news model ala Scoop Nisker's old KSAN news--and also I do believe in supporting ideas; nonetheless from the point of view of achieving something, this grant would have to be on the failure list.

(8) Esalen Institute School

At the time of making this grant, I described it this way:

> To assist an experimental school on the Esalen grounds, for the Esalen staff children. In previous years Esalen discouraged the participation of children in the daily life of the institute, thus leaving some humans conspicuously absent from sharing in the "human potential" work of the institute.

The best thing about this grant was that it was only $871 because all that happened with the money was that Esalen was able to finish up its first experimental year without having to fold the place, and then never did it again. So the grant accomplished nothing.

Comment: Shit. (Pronounced: Sh-e-e-e-e-et.)

(9) Norma Whittacker

This was an agent grant for this extremely able and talented public relations woman whom, I thought, would use it toward a public interest public relations function not unlike Susan Halas, thereby helping get access to the media for all manner of organizations and institutions and people who do not otherwise have it. Things began along those lines--Norma became the staff publicist for the Ellsberg-Russo Pentagon Papers trial--and we all know how much incredible mind-blowing news came out of that one. Not to say that Norma gets the credit, of course, what with Nixon and Ehrlichman in on the publicity trip. But She did run the smoothest, cleanest and most thorough press operation I've ever seen for a fast-breaking event like that.

Following the trial, however, Norma felt completely done-in, sick of politics, worked-out, fed up, etcetera and decided to just take time out to find some new energy and direction. What came

out of that is eloquently described in the attached personal report from herself (enclosed). She decided that, no, she was not going to be a publicist anymore but instead would fullfill a lifelong dream and become a (pause) psychologist! So she's enrolled and studying and says that her intention is to bring politics into psychology--a growing tendency anyway--so the end of this story is years away.

Comment: One of the first things we talked about in the early POINT meetings was the virtue of making grants (I should say the possible virtue) which did not have specific goals attached to them. I can remember advocating, in those days, the notion that with many people of proven ability, experience, and talent what was sometimes the most important thing was a period of free time to ponder themselves, their work, the meaning of it all and new directions. It's one thing to say that an effective community organizer, let's say, ought to be given grants for more effective community organizing, but it just may be that there's a greater "effectiveness" still in allowing that community organizer the time and freedom to be a great something else, who knows what? If there's fundamental talent and committment, then betting on the person seems to me as good a mode as betting on the work. You all know of my own experience with this. POINT provided me, effectively, with the chance to switch from one mode of work to some other and what will come of it eventually is two books that I'm working on that would never have gotten together otherwise. All of this is by way of saying that specific expectations for a grantee are sometimes are a dangerous and stupid trap that we can fall into and I as often as anyone. I really wanted and expected Norma to come up to San Francisco and do more of what she had been doing so very well for the previous ten years. But I didn't put that requirement in the grant because I believed in the "agent" concept and that that would work best with the least interference by me. You water the seed and then you see what grows. I don't know if Norma will become as great and important a psychologist as she was a political propogandist, or if she'll ever actually become a psychologist at all. But I wind up being pleased that she has charted out a new and interesting direction and given her known sense of responsibility and committment I remain confident that the results, on some level, will be beautiful, my own sense of goal orientation notwithstanding. (PS- Interesting report attached.)

(10) Merle Goldberg

This was a $5,000 "agent" grant all of which went immediately into Merle's work with the National Women's Health Coalition. Trying to summarize that organization's activities is like writing the bible on a pin but here are some highlights: The Coalition is now comprised of some 250 women's health groups around the country. Merle's role has been and is to keep them all in touch with each other and keep information moving through all of them. She has some 25 women helping her in New York

provided information to groups that collectively counselled some 800 abortion referrals per week, including arranging some 3,500 free abortions over the last two years. They also serviced some 350 requesss from around the country on how to open "well women" centers. The coalition organized a series of conferences for physcians and other medical people at the time of the Supreme Court Decision on abortion; organized the educational efforts concerning the effects of drugs upon fetal developments, including helping organize the campaign against DES (hormone); began a counselling service for women who are about to receive hysterectomies or mastectomies; published a booklet on atraumatic termination of pregnancy and have shipped out more than 25,000 copies in this country and abroad; created a lecture and slide show on pregnancy prevention and treatment, cancer detection etc.; organized the training for hundreds of paramedical people in women's health and abortion and have done similar training in the Karman abortion method for hundreds of doctors.

In addition, Merle is setting up a Women's Health Clinic at 80 Irving Place in NY which will offer both paramedical and medical services, and has spent considerable time in helping Harvey Karman stay out of jail from his old busts as an abortionist, and for practicing medicine without a license.

In our last conversation Merle remained incredibly energetic, and seems to be taking on more all the time...at the same time as she fund-raises. Most recently they have received a guaranteed $800 per month from the Scaife Foundation, so it's rolling along.

Comment: There is no question that in funding Merel we have funded an almost unbelievably energetic dynamic committed and effective person who's only limitation seems to be the number of hours in the day. Her main difficulties at this time, however might properly be called political. She is being roundly attacked on the right by the right-to-lifers and from the left by the anti-Karman forces. My own feeling is that she walks a centrist line which I am not sure is one that I personally agree with. The more I hear about Karman and his technique--usuzlly from women's health collective people--the more I begin to doubt him, and therefore Merle who is committed to him. Yet there is no question that from any effectiveness mode POINT would like to create, Merle would have to be seen as very successful. My only regret is that I didn't know her better and that I didn't investigate things a bit more thoroughly at the beginning.

(11) Council Grove Conference

This is an annual meeting for the purpose of discussing, learning about and hearing from people skilled in the arts of self-healing, particularly psychic healers, medicine men and women, yogis and other practitioners of self-controlled body and mind states. brings together the healers, and also scientists and medical people doing research in these areas.

The POINT grant help make possible the fifth of these conferences which also receive a lot of money from the Meninger Foundation.

Comment: Having attended this event, I commented in ~~the~~ my March 15 newsletter: "Weird and mind-blowing week. Came away more than ever convinced that they were all into something real which, however, I don't particularly want to get into further myself. What I learned in particular was that there's an incredible amount of power in those trips and a lot of power-oriented people into them and the combination may not be all to the good. I think if ever I give another grant in these areas, it's likely to be concerned with the implications of this sort of work and its dangers; how to use it well, in other words."

I would like to add today that this position still holds, especially now that suddenly the area of psychic phenomena is hotter than ecology. Also I finally decided it was silly to give $3000 to a conference that would have happened anyway, given the Meninger participation, and I'm unlikely to do that again. Just pissing in the river. So the conference itself was a worthwhile enough event, only the grantor, me, was stupid.

(12) Amnesty International

This was a small matching grant ($1500) to make possible the establishment of a Northern California headquarters for this international organization which works ceaselessy to free political prisoners in some 50 countries. Principally through the hard work of Ginetta Sagan (a 45 year old woman who was ruthlessly tortured by the Nazis in the WW II), Kit Bricca, Joan Baez and a lot of volunteers, this office has been working at a feverish pace in principally the following ways: 1) distributing a handbook for organizations interested in political prisoners in how to go about organizing around them, 2) publicizing conditions in the jails of, particularly, South Vietnam, Greece, Bolivia, Brazil and Chile, 3) collecting and distributing data on prisoners-of-conscience throughout the world, 4) organizing mass letter writing campaigns to governments, jailers, lawyers, prosecutors etcetera, 5) sending personal investigators to countries which are behaving reprehensibly, and compiling reports, as well as publicity, collaboration with peace groups, work with UN organizations etc etc etc.

Comment: In terms of efficiency, this was one of my most successful grants. For $1500 we made an office happen, and catalized a tremendous amount of energy which has been clearly felt. In some cases Ginetta has actually succeeded in visiting foreign countries and getting particular people (a number of journalists and doctors in particular) out of jail. It is difficult to express how devoted and effective these people are, and how brave. They are dealing directly with saving people's lives and in many instances have risked their own. Good grant.

(13) Goodworks Collective

$6,000 was granted to a collective of feminist activists, psychologists, group leaders, artists engaged in a range of educational & political projects, among them the following: (a) an ongoing consultation with army psychiatrists concerning child-beating by army mothers, (b) a series of seminars bringing housewives and prostitutes together, (c) establishment of gallery and store for women to sell their arts and crafts, (d) collaboration with National Feminist Party Convention, particularly in running panels related to women's studies, (e) organization of Alyssum, a feminist "growth center" presenting ongoing women's "consciousness-raising" groups and others, at very low cost, (f) collaborations with San Francisco Women's Health Center, the Women's Legal Center, and Tinker Women (concerned with jobs for women).

The group also began working toward the establishment of a San Francisco women's center and a number of organizing meetings and searches were performed in collaboration with the groups that are now part of the Women's Center at 1026 Masonic.

Some of the projects begun at the time of granting have been abandoned--the army-psychiatrist one; the gallery and store--but others have now become institutionalized. Alyssum has succeeded in catching hold as the first center of its kind in the country, serving dozens of women each week at a cost of less than one dollar per hour. The whores and housewives meetings eventually formed the basis of a book by Susan Margolis and in some ways led to the formation of Coyote. The collective was also a donor to and participant in the Feminist party media protest in Hollywood that is continuing now with Jacqueline Schwartz the leading feminist agitator there. But the collective failed to make itself continually viable in several ways: They were not able to raise money for the project as a whole--that is, for the collective--and so soon began splintering energy into the various participatory projects: Alysssym, the Health Center, the media events, the Legal Center etc. and, alas by now the Goodworks Collective is not functioning at all.

Comment: Probably this grant was made too early in the formation of this project. A group of women had been getting together with good ideas and several interesting separate projects, but the interesting projects remained separate, somehow, and the jelling never did take place. However, in a movement as young, innovative, and scatterred as it was in the beginning, a certain amount of support is necessary, I feel, without the traditional trappings that go into the grant-performance-success model that can be applied to, say, the Sierra Club. In effect, this grant enabled some 20-25 women to work together over about an 18 month period trying to plot out what needed to be done in themovement, what individual efforts ought to be made and what collaborative efforts were possible. Enormous energy was generated--as can be seen by the projects that are still ongoing--and judged by the standard of energy-seeding it seems to me the Goodworks group catalyzed a lot of goings-on that would not have happened otherwise and activated a number of very powerful women.

(14) Women's Legal Center

At the time of making this $2,600 grant I described it this way:
A collective of ten women legal workers, located in the Mission District of San Francisco, who are undertaking to provide legal counselling to women in need of same, to train other women's legal workersto do likewise, to educate the community towards a deflation of the "Legal Mystique" which has worked to keep many women from understanding their legal rights, and to catalyze change in laws and institutional practices which particularly discriminate against women, E.G., rape laws, practices concerning women in prison, laws relating to prostitution, marriage, job rights, welfare rights, etc.

In practice, however, much of the work had to be cut back to several areas. Sufficient funding was never found to turn the seed-grant into an ongoing truly broad project. The most spectacularly successful aspects of the project (as described in the groupgs own report enclosed) have been in the areas of free legal advice and referral services for poor women in divorce situations or stress situations around divorce. They have been similarly effective in advising on welfare matters and have been responsible for a number of articles on womenand the law in The Cospiracy, the National Lawyers Guild publication.

Comment: This project did not turn out to meet my own fantasy of what might happen as a result of the grant; I had thought that a full-scale training program for para-legal workers would happan, ala Merle Goldberg's para medical program, but it soon became clear that a lot more financial energy was going to be needed to make that happen and, once again, this group was not all that good at fund-raising. I mm beginning to think that the most important feminist project that one could fund would be a fund-raising service staffed by people with contacts and talent. Nonetheless the work the group did was ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ and still is very good. They continue to save a lot of people a lot of misery and seem to be making considerable progress in demystifying the legal trip for women that they serve in the Mission.

~~XXXX

C. Grants I definitely wouldn't make again: — Council Grove Conference, Barbara Richter

D. Total disasters: — Esalen Institute School, Herbert Kutchins/Police deaths

So much for 1972. When is the 1973 summary due?

Jerry Mander